

---

MEETING EAST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

DATE 8 SEPTEMBER 2011

PRESENT COUNCILLORS WISEMAN (CHAIR),  
DOUGLAS (VICE-CHAIR), KING,  
FITZPATRICK, FUNNELL, MCILVEEN,  
WATSON, HYMAN AND WARTERS

APOLOGIES COUNCILLOR FIRTH

---

<b>Site</b>	<b>Attended by</b>	<b>Reason for Visit</b>
The Laurels, Brecks Lane, Strensall, York YO32 5UZ	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters and Wiseman	To familiarise Members with the site as the application had been called in by the Ward Member.
168 New Lane, Huntington, York YO32 9ND	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	To familiarise Members with the site.
279 Huntington Road, York YO30 9BR	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	As the site had previously been considered by the Committee, but that significant amendments had been made to the previous application.
34 Eastward Avenue, York YO10 4LZ	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	As a previous application on the site had been determined by the Committee.

Bonneycroft, 22 Princess Road, Strensall, York YO32 5UD	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	As a previous application on the site had been determined by the Committee.
111 Newland Park Drive, York. YO10 3HR	Cllrs Barnes, Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters and Watson.	To familiarise Members with the site as the application had been called in by a Ward Member.  <i>As amended at the meeting of East Area Planning Sub-Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> November 2011.</i>
Kent Street Coach Park, Kent Street, York.	Cllrs Douglas, Fitzpatrick, Hyman, McIlveen, Warters, Watson and Wiseman.	To familiarise Members with the site.

## 15. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests they had in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Hyman declared a personal non prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 4d (279 Huntington Road) as he had spoken to one of the registered speakers in objection, but had not expressed an interest.

Councillors Douglas, Funnell and Hyman all declared personal and non prejudicial interests in Agenda Item 4m (Kent Street Coach Park) as past Council representatives on the Fire Authority.

Councillor King declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 4m (Kent Street Coach Park) as the Council's representative on the Fire Authority. He left the room and took no part in the discussion of the item.

No other interests were declared.

**16. MINUTES**

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the East Area Planning Sub-Committee held on 11 August be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**17. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

It was reported that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation scheme on general issues within the remit of the Committee.

**18. PLANS LIST**

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development), relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views and advice of consultees and officers.

**18a Vue Cinema, Stirling Road, York. YO30 4XY (11/00516/FUL)**

Members considered a full application from Derby Property Investments for a single storey restaurant on land within the Vue Cinema car park at Clifton Moor.

In their update to Members, Officers spoke about drainage and the potential percentage of car parking spaces being used by customers of the restaurant. In relation to drainage, it was reported that some work might have to be carried out to connect the restaurant to the main drain. Officers identified an error in

their report, which gave a percentage of parking demand for both the proposed hotel and the proposed restaurant. The application for the hotel was determined at the meeting of the Committee in August.

Officers reported that they had received representations from the owners of an adjacent public house, who spoke about how the proposed facility would reduce the number of parking spaces on the site for other businesses and therefore might lead to customers parking off site, or taking their custom elsewhere.

Representations were received from the applicant's agent he felt that there would be a sufficient number of parking spaces, that the impact on the character of the area would be minimal as the design of the restaurant would be similar to an existing restaurant nearby. He also stated how he felt that application was consistent with government policy in that it was sustainable and could create jobs.

Members asked the agent questions about transportation to the restaurant, particularly about cycle provision. Some Members felt that it would be beneficial for a joint cycle/motorcycle area to be placed adjacent to the restaurant.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance with particular reference to:

- The principle of development;
- Residential amenity;
- Visual impact;
- Highways and car parking;
- Sustainability;
- Drainage; and
- Contaminated land

As such the proposal complies with national planning advice contained with Planning Policy Statement 4 "Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth" and Policies SP6, SP7a, GP1, GP4a, T4, T7c, and S6 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

**18b The Laurels, Brecks Lane, Strensall, York. YO32 5UZ  
(11/00676/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Mr D Gath for the erection of 8 two storey dwellings with gardens and associated garages with new access to Brecks Lane, following the demolition of an existing bungalow.

Representations in objection were received from a next door neighbour. He stated that he felt that the revised drawings submitted by the applicant were not suitable, that the height of houses proposed would be out of kilter with other properties in the vicinity and that residents felt that the development would not fit in.

Representations in support were received from the agent for the applicant. He informed the Committee that foul water would be displaced to an adopted water sewer in Littlethorpe Close, and that the pipe was deemed to be capable of taking this additional water. In relation to the impact on adjacent properties, in particular plot 5, the agent said that there had been a change in level of 500 mm which reduced the aspect from number 15 Littlethorpe Close of the properties. Finally he stated that he felt that the density of development was consistent with the vicinity.

Representations were received from a member of Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council. He spoke about how he felt that the loss of amenity to neighbouring properties would be restricted to half of the site, but remained concerned about surface water. In relation to the roadway that was proposed, he highlighted that a footpath alongside the road did not exist and that problems could arise with cars parking on Brecks Lane, which would lead to blocking the access for both residents and refuse vehicles.

Representations were received from Councillor Doughty, the Ward Member. He stated that he was in agreement with local residents, in that the proposal constituted overdevelopment and that the buildings would be overbearing. He added that the proposals relating to properties 5-8 could breach policy on scale and mass and stated that the Local Planning Authority could now determine density on application sites, and suggested that Members should take into account the density of the surrounding area when making their decision.

Officers from the Environmental Protection Unit attended the meeting, and answered questions from Members relating to contamination(the application site was on a former landfill site) and to foul water.

Officers reported that a condition would be attached to planning permission, for a remediation scheme to cover any work that needed to be done in order to decontaminate the site. In relation to the dispersal of foul water, it was reported that the public sewer did have capacity to take the water, but that not all of the pipe was owned by the water company. As such, the drains connected to the properties would be private.

During their debate, Members felt that they could support the application if a footpath was built to access the properties, that permitted development rights for extensions be removed and if a condition be added for landscaping to mitigate privacy issues.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved.

**REASON:** In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference the residential amenity of the neighbours, the visual amenity of the dwellings, and the locality, and highway safety. As such, the proposal complies with policies GP1, GP10, H4a, ED4 and L1c of the City of York Council Development Control Local Plan (2005); national planning guidance contained in Planning Policy Statement 1 "Delivering Sustainable Development" and Planning Policy Statement 3 "Housing".

**18c 168 New Lane, Huntington, York YO32 9ND (11/01503/FUL)**

Members considered a full application from Mr Mick Wood for a single and two storey side extensions and porch to the front of the property.

Some Members suggested that if approved, a condition should be added to planning permission to not allow for the extension to be 2.5 metres over the neighbouring property's boundary.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be approved.

**REASON:** In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on neighbours' living conditions and the appearance of the streetscene. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

**18d 279 Huntington Road, York YO30 9BR (11/01652/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Mr and Mrs G Cammidge for the erection of 5 terraced dwellings with associated access following the demolition of 279 Huntington Road.

In their update to Members, Officers reported that the Parish Council had raised no objections to the application.

Verbal representations were received from a next door neighbour in objection, who represented a group of other residents who had sent in written objections. She felt that the proposal constituted overdevelopment on the site and that a previous application that had been granted had been on a larger site. She also raised safety concerns, in that the development would lead to the creation of an additional road junction, which she felt would be dangerous as it was on a cycle route and close to a bus stop. She felt that the application should be refused due to an increase in noise, a lack of privacy for adjacent neighbours, and the possible dangers of entering and exiting the site.

Representations in support were received from the agent for the applicant. He outlined the changes that had been made following the previous application on the site that had been considered by the Committee in April. He stated that elevational design had been altered due to Members' comments.

It was noted that the reason for refusal of the application in April was due to a change in government policy, not on design grounds.

Members suggested that a condition be added to amend the design of the properties so that windows would be added in the sloping roof space.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report and the following additional conditions;

6. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings details of all means of enclosure to the site boundaries including adjacent to 275, 277, 279a and 281 Huntington Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing 11/01652/FUL Page 3 of 14 by the Local Planning Authority before the development commences and shall be provided before the development is occupied.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenities and security of the area.

7. No development shall take place until there has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a detailed landscaping scheme which shall illustrate the number, species, height and position of trees and shrubs. This scheme shall be implemented within a period of six months of the completion of the development. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and



species, unless alternatives are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with the variety, suitability and disposition of species within the site.

8. Details of the proposed entrance gates shown on drawing 10:03:02 rev K dated 08/01/10 shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. The gates shall be erected in accordance with the agreed details prior to the occupation of the dwellings and the gates shall be maintained in a fully efficient working order unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide a secure environment for future occupiers and occupiers of adjacent dwellings.

9. Prior to the development coming into use, all areas used by vehicles shall be surfaced, sealed and positively drained within the site, in accordance with details which have been previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent the egress of water and loose material onto the public highway and minimise flood risk.

13. No part of the site shall come into use until the turning areas have been provided in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter the turning areas shall be retained free of all obstructions and used solely for the intended purpose.

Reason: To enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear thereby ensuring the safe and free passage of traffic on the public highway.

25. The hours of construction, loading or unloading on the site shall be confined to 8:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday, 9:00 to 13:00 Saturday and no working on Sundays or public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenities of adjacent residents

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to:

- impact on living conditions of adjacent occupiers
- impact on streetscene
- impact on visual amenity
- quality of accommodation
- parking and highway safety
- sustainability
- drainage and flood risk
- wildlife and landscaping
- development potential of adjoining land
- security

As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, GP4a, GP7, GP9, GP10, GP15a, NE2, NE1, NE7, H4a, H5a of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

**18e 34 Eastward Avenue, York YO10 4LZ (11/02045/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Mr Ahmed Karbani for a two storey rear extension with balcony, two storey extension to front incorporating porch, alterations to roof, with gates, brick piers, wall and railings to the front.

In their update to Members, Officers stated they had received additional objections from the Parish Council and two adjoining neighbours stating that they felt that the porch was too large for the setting. Members asked questions about the size of the porch, in particular if the size was reduced if this would lead to approval.

Representations in objection were received from a local resident. She spoke about how she felt the proposed extension would be incongruous to the surrounding area, dominant and that a reduction in space for car parking could exacerbate parking problems.

Representations in support were received from the applicant. He spoke about how he felt that objections to the applicant were not related to the development and how there were a number of houses in the area of various designs. He stated how he felt that there would be no parking problems that could arise from the development on the site.

Representations were received from a member of Fulford Parish Council. He stated that the Parish Council supported the Officer's recommendation for refusal because they felt that the depth of the porch would extend past other similar porches in neighbouring properties and that the design of the roof would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Members highlighted that the porch had already been extended from the 2 metres applied for to 2.2 metres, and asked how the 2 metres length could be enforced, when foundations for 2.2 metres had already been dug. Officers stated that the applicants would be advised to cease work before developing and stated that it would be in the interest of the owners to comply with this.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be refused.

**REASON:** It is considered that the additional forward extension of the front porch would appear as an unduly prominent, incongruous and uncharacteristic addition which would be harmful to the appearance of the property and wider streetscene. Thus it is considered that the proposal would conflict with national planning advice in relation to design contained with Planning Policy Statement 1 "Delivering Sustainable Development", Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan (Fourth Set of Changes-April 2005) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance "Guide to Alterations and

Extensions to Private Dwelling Houses”  
(March 2001).

**18f 9 Langsett Grove, York YO30 4DE (11/01708/FUL)**

Members considered an application by Mr Martin Stoner for a two storey side extension with a conservatory to rear.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer’s report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the impact on the streetscene and the effect on the amenity and living conditions of the neighbours. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the ‘Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses’ Supplementary Planning Guidance.

**18g Bonneycroft, 22 Princess Road, Strensall, York YO32 5UD**

Members considered an outline major application for a residential development of 10 dwellings.

In their update to Members, Officers reported that an objection had been received from the local MP who felt that the development would be out of character with the local area and asked for any extensions to be restricted to a height of two storeys. It was stated that the development would remove a number of protected trees, but that the Council’s Tree Officer felt that the trees in question were of limited amenity. Officers also stated that if approved, that they recommended that a drainage condition be added to include a topographical survey and a maintenance plan.

Members asked several questions to Officers relating to the trees on site including; if the proposed trees would adequately screen the dwellings from the road and if Tree Protection Orders (TPO) could be placed on these. Officers suggested to

Members, that it was practice to be cautious when listing trees as TPOs. Other Members asked questions regarding stipulations from Network Rail on the site's boundary being adjacent to a railway line and why there was no provision made for social housing on the site.

Representations in objection were received from a representative of the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE). He stated that the CPRE objected to application due to the detrimental effect on the conservation area. He stated that to allow for the screening of the development that the undergrowth would have to be disturbed and that this could detrimentally affect all the trees.

Representations in objection were received from a local resident, he stated that he wished that the applicant would clarify the height properties and was concerns that the garage at plot number 5 in the development could unsettle the foundations of the trees in his garden.

Representations in support were received from the applicant's agent. He spoke about the density of the development on the site and stated that the national guidance was for 20 units per hectare, rather than the 10 proposed. He clarified that all the properties would have a height of two storeys apart from a terrace of three properties, facing on to Princess Road, which would be 2.5 storeys tall. He felt that there would be no adverse impact on the trees on the site because of the low density of the development, but stated that the applicant would plant new trees if the application was approved.

Representations were received from a member of Strensall with Towthorpe Parish Council. He wished for clarification on the height of the properties facing on to Princess Road, as the Officer's report had stated that they would be three storeys but the applicant had stated 2.5 storeys. The Officer stated that the reference in the report referred to accommodation possibly being designed on three floors, rather than three storeys. He also spoke about how there was a lack of amenity space at the back of the properties and that the Conservation Area extended on to the boundary of the site.

Representations were received from the Ward Member, Councillor Doughty. He felt that the placing of the gable end of the properties on to the railway side would appear awkwardly

dominant. He also commented that because the rear elevations of the properties would now face Princess Road, that refuse bins would clearly be visible by neighbours. He also felt that the site could benefit from more greenery.

In response to their questions, Members were informed by Officers that a grass verge would be covered in tarmac to allow for a pedestrian crossing, and that they could not confirm how many trees would be lost from the site. In addition, it was reported that Officers were satisfied that the trees that had been picked for felling were easily replaceable.

Some Members felt that the application should be approved because the size of the development had reduced from previous applications and that it would be screened by existing trees.

Other Members commented on how they felt that there would be insufficient amenity space for three of the proposed properties, and that there would be a detrimental impact on the retained trees.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: (i) The proposed terraced houses (units 8,9 and 10) would, by reason of their, height, massing and prominent location towards the front of the site, result in an incongruous form of development out of scale and character with the street scene and harmful to the setting of the adjacent conservation area. This harm would be exacerbated by the houses' main amenity space being located at the front of the site, which would be likely to result in the gardens being used for the storage and use of domestic paraphernalia typically associated with residential use (such as sheds, washing lines and play equipment) that could not reasonably be controlled by planning conditions. The application therefore contrary to national planning policy guidance PPS1 (Delivering Sustainable Development) and Planning Policy Statement 5 (Planning for the Historic Environment), and Policies GP1 (Design), GP10 (Subdivision of gardens and Infill Development) and HE2 (Development in

Historic Locations) of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

- (ii) The development would be likely to result in the removal of a number of trees that significantly contribute to the visual amenity of the area and are subject to a Tree Preservation Order, without providing adequate compensatory replacement. The loss would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and the setting of the adjacent conservation area. The application is therefore contrary to policies NE1 (Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows), HE2 (Development in Historic Locations) and GP10 (Subdivision of Gardens) of the City of York Draft Local Plan.
  
- (iii) The proposed layout would provide inadequate private amenity space for the terraced houses at units 8, 9 and 10, with very limited space to the rear of the three storey family dwellings. The area to the front would be open, due to the street frontage location and the need to safeguard mature protected trees (which would limit natural daylight to this area). The development would not therefore provide an adequate standard of amenity for the prospective occupants so the application is contrary to policy GP1 (Design) of the City of York Draft Local Plan, which states that development proposals will be expected to, inter alia, provide and protect private, individual or communal amenity space for residential and commercial developments.

**18h 10 Larchfield, York YO31 1JS (11/01928/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Ms Claire Wilson for a single storey rear extension on the rear elevation of a semi detached dormer bungalow.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the effect on residential amenity and the impact on the streetscene. As such, the proposal complies with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

**18i 87 Newland Park Drive, York YO10 3HR (11/01957/FUL)  
WITHDRAWN**

This application was withdrawn by the applicant before the meeting, and so was not considered by the Committee.

**18j 89 Newland Park Drive, York. YO10 3HR (11/01548/FUL)  
WITHDRAWN**

This application was withdrawn by the applicant before the meeting, and so was not considered by the Committee.

**18k 111 Newland Park Drive, York. YO10 3HR (11/01937/FUL)**

Members considered a full application by Mr Colin Packer for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

Representations were received from the Ward Member Councillor Barnes. He spoke about how a number of houses had applied for planning permission on Newland Park Drive within the past six months and that he felt that this property would be rented out to students. He stated that a number of local residents objected to the application because of overdevelopment and an increase in traffic due to a possible larger number in residents in one property.

During their discussion Members commented that they perceived that the extension was considerably higher than the neighbouring property, and that it was overdominant to the



property at number 113. Other Members felt that number of properties with extensions had led to a terracing aspect on one side of Newland Park Drive, and that therefore the application should be refused.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: It is considered that the proposed extension, by virtue of its size and scale, would appear unduly oppressive and overbearing when viewed from the rear of the neighbouring property at 113 Newland Park Drive and would thus detract from the standard of amenity that the occupiers of this property could reasonably expect to enjoy. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policies GP1 (i) and H7 (d) of the City of York Draft Local Plan, and with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance "A Guide to Extensions and Alterations to Private Dwelling Houses" March 2001.

**181 41 Lea Way, Huntington, York YO32 9PE (11/02134/FUL)**

Members considered an full application by Mr Russ Broadbent for a flat roof attached garage on the side of the property at 41 Lea Way.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the Officer's report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the amenity and living conditions of the nearby neighbours and the impact on the street scene. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1 "Design" and H7 "Residential Extensions" of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

**18m Kent Street Coach Park, Kent Street, York (11/01627/OUTM)**

Members considered a major outline application by North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue for the erection of a fire station with training tower and associated facilities following demolition of a disused toilet block.

Councillor King urged Members to consider the application on purely planning grounds, before retiring from the table and taking no part in discussion.

Members asked Officers why the cut off time for training had changed from 18.00 to 21.00. In response it was reported that the time change was proposed to not preclude those on the evening shift from attending training sessions, and that daytime only training did not fit in with fire service operations.

Representations were received from the agent for the applicant. He spoke about how the application sought permission for the principle of development on the site. He added that the amenity of the residents were considered in the proposal as the applicants had consulted with the Environmental Protection Unit (EPU). It was reported that specialised training would only take place twice a month and that sirens would only be used when fire engines could not exit the station, such as in heavy traffic.

Representations were received from the Ward Member, Councillor Taylor. He spoke about the archaeological significance of the site, and that the lack of comments from the Planning Panel did not mean that they gave tacit approval to the application. He also added that the noise from basic training would constitute an annoyance.

Members asked if traffic lights could turn to red to allow for traffic to not block fire engines when turning out of the station, so that they would not have to use sirens.

Officers responded that an informative relating to this could be added to planning permission, if the application was approved.

Members asked if there had been any complaints from other residential areas of the city that had a fire station in their area. Officers from EPU stated that there were not aware of any complaints.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved.

REASON: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposal, subject to the conditions listed above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the development in principle, the impact on the amenity of surrounding occupants, the impact on the appearance of the area, flood risk, highway safety and archaeology. As such the proposal complies with Policies GP1, GP4, GP6, NE1, HE10, and T4 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

Informative: Highway management - In the interests of the amenity of surrounding occupants the fire service is asked to consult officers in highway network management in order to secure priority for fire tenders at the junction of Kent Street and Barbican Road, and Barbican Road/Paragon Street.

## **19. APPEALS PERFORMANCE AND DECISION SUMMARIES**

Members received a report which informed Members of the Council's performance in relation to appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate in the 3 month period up to 30 June 2011 and provided a summary of the salient points from appeals determined in that period.

RESOLVED: That the content of the report be noted.

REASON: So that Members can be kept informed on appeals determined by the Planning Inspectorate.

## **20. URGENT BUSINESS**

The Committee were informed that a previous application that had been refused at the January meeting had now been approved on appeal.

Some Members commented that they had received comments from local residents about the application. Officers noted these comments and stated that they would pass these on to the Health and Safety Executive.

Councillor S Wiseman, Chair  
[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 5.15 pm].